



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

5  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,635	08/06/2003	Wayne J. Smith	R237A	1634
22692	7590	11/04/2004	EXAMINER	
REGINALD F ROBERTS JR PO BOX 4535 BATON ROUGE, LA 70821-4535				SELF, SHELLEY M
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		3725		

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/604,635	SMITH, WAYNE J. <i>CH</i>
	Examiner Shelley Self	Art Unit 3725

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6 and 7 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 August 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

Applicant's election of the invention of Group I (clms. 1-5) in the reply filed October 18, 2004 has been acknowledged. The election has been deemed an election without traverse due to the lack of any traversal arguments submitted.

Claims 6 and 7 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on October 18, 2004.

### *Drawings*

New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because of *poor legibility of reference characters and clarity*. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Specification*

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The specification is missing page numbers. Correction is required.

Paragraph 32, the following corrections are necessary:

*"is pivotally connected to the base 4"* should be **–is pivotally connected to the base 4–**

*"by a pin 16"* should be **–by a pin 16–**

*"by a"* should be **– by a–**

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-5 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,604,561. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the pending application are merely a broader re-worded version of that of the patent application and fail to set forth any differing patentable subject matter. Accordingly the claims of the pending application and the Patent are not patentably distinct from each other.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1, lines 7-10 of claim are functional. The claim fails to positively recite any structure necessary to carry out the functional recitations, *“the detachable head being constructed and arranged for attachment...and separation...”*

With regard to claim 2, lines 12-17 are functional. The claim fails to set forth structure necessary to carry out the functional recitations, *“...a detachable head, constructed and arranged for engaging the tree...and for disengagement from the second end...the head remaining attached to the tree...”*

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 as best as can be understood are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Atherton et al. (4,564,173). Atherton discloses a tree pusher (fig. 1) comprising a base (22) a detachable head (figs. 2, 4); and means/jack, mounted on the base, for supporting the

detachable head and for urging the detachable head against the tree (10,12,14,16); the detachable head being constructed and arranged for attachment to the tree while the tree is being felled, and for separation from the rest of the tree pusher and remaining attached to the tree as the tree falls. Examiner notes that the screw of head 30 allows the head to be detachable.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 2 as best as can be understood is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swanson (2,960,309) in view of Atherton et al. (4,564,173). Swanson discloses a tree pusher (fig. 1) comprising a base: a screw jack (26) a first tube (28) having first and second ends, the first end connected to the jack (26): a second tube (27) having a first and second ends, the second tube having a smaller cross-sectional area than the first tube (fig. 1) the first end of the second tube being disposed in and fastened to the second end of the first tube; a head (fig. 2); and a base (25) for the head (fig. 2). Swanson does not disclose the head to be detachable. Atherton teaches in a similar art the use of detachable head (30) in conjunction with a jack mechanism for pushing a tree during a felling operation. Because the references are from such a closely related art, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one having ordinary skill in the art to replace Swanson's non-detachable head with a detachable head for ease of replacement or adjustability as taught by Atherton.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shelley Self whose telephone number is (703) 305-5299. The examiner can normally be reached Mon-Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Supervisor, Allen Ostrager can be reached at (703) 308-3136. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular and After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SSelf  
November 1, 2004



ALLEN OSTRAGER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700